

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XV, Issue No. 1

July 2009

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

12 Important Problems Needing Answers

An Open Letter to Our Nation's
Leadership

From a woman in Arizona

I'm a home grown American, 53, registered Democrat all my life. Before the last presidential election I registered as a Republican because I no longer felt the Democratic Party represents my views or works to pursue issues important to me. Now I feel the same about the Republican Party. The fact is I no longer feel any political party or representative in Washington represents me or pursues the issues important to me.

Well, these are briefly the issues for which I seek representation:

One, illegal immigration. I want you to secure our borders. No amnesty, not again. Been there, done that. P.S., I'm not a racist. This isn't to be confused with legal immigration.

Two, Repeal the TARP bill. We told you no, but you did it anyway. I want the remaining unfunded 95% repealed. Freeze, repeal.

Three, Czars, I want the circumvention of our checks and balances stopped immediately. Fire the czars. Government officials answer to the process, not to the president. Start honoring our Constitution.

Four, cap and trade. The debate on global warming is not over. There is more to say.

Five, universal healthcare. I will not be rushed into another expensive decision. Don't you dare try to pass this in the middle of the night and then go on break. Slow down!

Six, growing government control. I want states rights and sovereignty fully restored. I want less government, not more. Shrink it down.

Seven, ACORN. I do not want ACORN and its affiliates in charge of our 2010 census. I want them investigated. If it walks like a duck and talks like a duck, hello. Stop protecting your political buddies.

Eight, redistribution of wealth. No, no, no. I work for my money. It is mine. I have always worked for people with more money than I have because they gave me jobs. That is the only redistribution of wealth that I will support.

Nine, charitable contributions. Charity belongs in our local communities, where we know our needs best and can use our local talent and our local resources. Butt out, please. We want to do it ourselves.

Ten, corporate bailouts. Knock it off. Sink or swim like the rest of us. Let the strong survive. Quick and painful. Have you ever ripped off a Band-Aid? Great things happen in America under great hardship. Give us the chance to innovate. We cannot disappoint you more than you have disappointed us.

Eleven, transparency and accountability. Please stop trying to manipulate and appease me with clever wording. I am not the idiot you obviously take me for. Stop hiding things from me.

Twelve, unprecedented quick spending. Stop it now.

I entrusted you with upholding the Constitution. You are very far off course. Do you really think I find humor in a bill that you signed into law without knowing what it contained?

We want all of you to stop focusing on your reelection and do the job we want done. You work for us and at this rate I guarantee you not for long because we are coming. We are the formerly silent majority. Our numbers are great. Unlike you, we have their

trust. We will represent them honestly, rest assured. They will be at the polls on voting day to usher you out of office. We do not come in violence, but we are angry. You will represent us or you will be replaced with someone who will.

Democrat, Republican, independent, libertarian. We don't care. Political parties are meaningless to us. We are going to fire all of you who abuse power and seek more. It is not your power. It is ours and we want it back. You are dishonorable. You are dishonest. As Americans we are ashamed of you. If you are not representing your constituency loudly and consistently, in spite of the objections of your party, you will be fired. You need to be loyal to us, not to them. Because we will get you fired and they will not save you. If you do or can represent me, my issues, my views, please stand up. If you do not speak up, you will be herded out with the rest of the sheep and we will replace the whole d*** congress if need be one by one. We are coming. Are we coming for you? Who do you represent? What do you represent? Listen. Because we are coming. We the people are coming.

-- Excerpts from Open Letter dated June 17, 2009

Decentralization, Totalitarianism and Propaganda

"Only a large-scale popular movement toward decentralization and self-help can arrest the present tendency toward statism... A really efficient totalitarian state would be one in which the all-powerful executive of political bosses and their army of managers control a population of slaves who do not have to be coerced,

because they love their servitude. To make them love it is the task assigned, in present-day totalitarian states, to ministries of propaganda, newspaper editors and schoolteachers." ~Aldous Huxley, Forward to *Brave New World*, 1932

The Second Amendment and the States

Why the Supreme Court should strike down Chicago's handgun ban

By Damon W. Root

The Supreme Court decision in *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2009) settled the fact that the Second Amendment guarantees the individual right to keep and bear arms. Yet that ruling applied only to the federal government (which oversees Washington, D.C.). Does it apply against state and local governments as well?

Although *Heller* never answered that question, Justice Antonin Scalia's majority opinion did provide a potent hint. In footnote 23, he observed that while *U.S. v. Cruikshank* (1876) stated that the Second Amendment did not apply against the states, *Cruikshank* also said that the First Amendment did not apply against the States and did not engage in the sort of Fourteenth Amendment inquiry required by our later cases."

But in fact the Supreme Court has been protecting First Amendment rights from state and local abuse since *Gitlow v. New York* (1925), under the so-called incorporation doctrine, whereby most of the Bill of Rights and certain other fundamental rights have been incorporated against states abuse via the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment, which reads, "nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

Since *Cruikshank* is a dead letter when it comes to free speech why should it apply to gun rights? The incorporation doctrine governs now, not the long-dead reasoning behind *Cruikshank*.

This controversy lies at the center of last week's unfortunate decision in *National Rifle Association v. Chicago*, where the federal 7th Circuit Court of Appeals held that the Second Amendment offers zero protection against the draconian gun control laws currently in place in Chicago and Oak Park, Illinois.

As Alan Gura (who previously won *Heller*) demonstrates in

the appeal he filed with the Supreme Court, not only did the 7th Circuit decline "to perform the required incorporation analysis," the court "erred in failing to heed *Heller's* cautionary statement that the pre-incorporation relics [including *Cruikshank*] lack 'the sort of Fourteenth Amendment inquiry required by our later cases.'"

Moreover, the 7th Circuit suggested that federalism would best be served by letting the states disregard the Second Amendment entirely. "Federalism is an older and more deeply rooted tradition than is a right to carry any particular kind of weapon," Chief Judge Frank Easterbrook wrote for the three-judge panel.

Yet as Gura rightfully responds, "To claim that of all rights, the Second Amendment must yield to local majoritarian impulses is especially wrong considering that the rampant violation of the right to keep and bear arms was understood to be among the chief evils vitiated [corrected] by adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment." Indeed, the 14th Amendment was specifically ratified by the Radical Republicans after the Civil War to protect the recently freed slaves from the infamous Black Codes, which curtailed property rights, liberty of contract, free speech, and the right to keep and bear arms.

The Second Amendment deserves the exact same respect as the rest of the Bill of Rights, nearly all of which have now been incorporated, something Gura is careful to explain. Which is precisely what the 7th Circuit should have said.

So what does all this mean for the future of the Second Amendment and gun rights? Last January, the 2nd Circuit, including Supreme Court nominee Judge Sonia Sotomayor, reached the same erroneous conclusion about incorporation as the did the Seventh Circuit. Yet in April, the 9th Circuit got it right, holding in *Nordyke v. King* that, "the right to keep and bear arms is 'deeply rooted in this Nation's history and tradition'... [and] is necessary to the Anglo-American conception of ordered liberty." This split among the circuits means the Supreme Court will almost certainly take up the issue.

Given Gura's provocative and sharply reasoned appeal, and given that Chicago's contested handgun ban closely resembles the D.C. ban nullified by *Heller*, this case

offers the perfect opportunity for the Court to fully restore the Second Amendment to its rightful place in our constitutional system.

-- June 11, 2009,

reason.com/news/show/134062.html

The World According to Brady

We have previously examined how Right-to-Carry (RTC) laws – state laws empowering private citizens freedom to defend themselves in public – seem to provide a safety benefit for law enforcement officer (LEOs). Armed citizens in RTC states account for the majority of America's justifiable homicide, further reducing the violent predator pool.

Each year, the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence publishes a report card, grading each state on how well they did with enacting "sensible" gun laws. In 2007 10 of Brady's 12 "top" states (11 states plus District of Columbia) are not RTC.

These "best" Brady states in 2007 had violent crime rate averaging 512.4 incidents per 100,000 population. Brady's 12 "worst" states had an average violent crime rate of 392.2.

There is another dataset that sheds light on what kind of world Brady envisions for our future.

Each year, the FBI publishes the number of full-time law enforcement employees by state. When collating states' LEO rate (officers per 100,000 population) with violent crime rates and Brady grades, an interesting trend appears.

In comparing the number of LEOs and violent crime and murder rates (all per 100,000 population) with the Brady score (the higher score is "better") here's how RTC states compare to non-RTC states:

RTC: 224 LEOs, 400.5 violent crimes, 4.9 murders, Brady score 11.0
Non-RTC: 288 LEOs, 524.3 violent crimes, 6.8 murders, Brady score 48.6

Thus even though non-RTC states have 28.9% more LEOs they suffer 30.9% more violent crimes and 38.6% more murders than RTC states.

States with higher Brady scores have larger police forces, but this does not translate into a safer place to live. Whether or not this means that the Brady Campaign supports larger but less efficient, government (i.e. more taxes, less service) will be examined in the next article in this series. -- *Austin Gun Rights Examiner*,

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

U.S. : FRNs Yes, private gold and silver coins No

ASHEVILLE — Federal authorities arrested an Asheville man in what they said was a scheme to undermine the U.S. currency system and defraud consumers with so-called Liberty Dollars.

William Innes marketed the "barter" currency and recruited merchants willing to accept it for products bought with real money, according to the indictment.

Innes, 53, faces up to 45 years in prison. He was indicted along with Bernard von NotHaus, president of the National Organization for the Repeal of the Federal Reserve and Internal Revenue Codes.

Liberty Dollars are coins made of silver or gold and are touted as inflation-proof and a way to encourage buying local goods.

"When groups seek to undermine the U.S. currency system, the government is compelled to act," said acting U.S. Attorney Edward Ryan of the Western District of North Carolina.

"These coins are not government-produced coinage, yet purchasers were led to believe that they should be spent like U.S. Federal Reserve Notes," Ryan said. "Such claims are in violation of federal law."

Innes and von NotHaus are charged with uttering and passing coins resembling genuine U.S. coins and intended for use as money, mail fraud and selling and possessing Liberty Dollar coins with intent to defraud.

Despite warnings from the federal government to the contrary, Innes told the *Citizen-Times* in 2006 that Liberty Dollars were legal.

"One of the first things I did when I started this in Asheville was go to the police and tell them what I was doing," he said then.

Von NotHaus created his organization in Evansville, Ind., in 1998, and developed the Liberty Dollar. He touted the silver medallions as an inflation-proof alternative to official currency. — *CitizenTimes.com* June 5, 2009

Ed.: no doubt U.S. Attorneys will indict the actual "groups that seek to undermine the U.S. currency system", the Governors of the Federal Reserve System and their underlings at the 12 regional Federal Reserve banks??

U.N. Seeks "Stable Funding"

The United Nations is proceeding, with President Obama's acquiescence, to implement an international socialist order financed by the American people.

The Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and its Impact on Development will consider adoption of a document calling for "new voluntary and innovative sources of financing initiatives to provide additional stable sources of development finance..." That's U.N.-speak for global taxes, as on greenhouse gas emissions and financial transactions such as stock trades.

The conference will take place June 24-26 at the U.N. in New York. The so-called "outcome document" endorses the U.N.'s Millennium Development Goals, which would require the payment of \$845 billion by U.S. taxpayers. MDGs are an objective of the Global Poverty Act, which Barack Obama introduced as a U.S. senator. It requires the U.S. to devote 0.7 percent of Gross National Income to foreign aid.

Now, as President, Obama can direct Ambassador to the U.N. Susan Rice to approve the U.N. conference document. Then the pressure will be on Congress to satisfy our "international commitments."

This is the pattern Obama followed to provide even more money to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Based on the G-20 summit agreement, the Obama White House slipped \$108 billion of cash and credit for the IMF into the emergency war funding bill.

The U.N. conference document explains where all of this is leading—the destruction of the dollar as the world's reserve currency.

It declares that "We acknowledge the calls by many states for further study of the feasibility and advisability of a more efficient reserve system, including the possible function of SDRs in any such system and the complementary roles that could be played by various regional arrangements." SDRs are Special Drawing Rights, a form of international currency that enables global institutions like the IMF to lend money to governments throughout the world.

The nerve center of this emerging new international socialist system will be the United Nations, a body that has developed a reputation for corruption and incompetence and

whose "peacekeepers" have been implicated in sexual abuse and other human rights violations.

-- Cliff Kincaid, June 24, 2009.
Kincaid is author of *Global Bondage: The UN Plan to Rule the World*

Obama, the "sort of God"

Attention about President Obama's lack of a long-form birth certificate proving his eligibility for office got a boost today when radio host Rush Limbaugh joked about the subject in comparing Obama to God.

Asking rhetorically what God has in common with Obama, Limbaugh said, "Neither has a birth certificate."

"How do they differ?" Limbaugh continued. "God does not think he's Obama. And there's another difference. Liberals love Obama."

Limbaugh repeated the punch lines several times throughout his show and noted, "another difference is that Obama gets better press. ... and God only demands to be worshipped once a week."

Later, he sprinkled in other differences, including:

God asks for only 10 percent of your money

God gives you freedom to live your life as you choose

God's plan to save us is actually written down for you to read

The comparison to God comes after recent comments by Newsweek editor Evan Thomas, who said on MSNBC's "Hardball" that Obama was "sort of God."

-- WorldNetDaily, June 10, 2009

Orders revoked for soldier challenging prez

A U.S. Army reserve major scheduled for deployment to Afghanistan has had his orders revoked after arguing he should not be required to serve under a president who has not proven his eligibility for office.

His attorney, Orly Taitz, told WND "We won!...It means that the military has nothing to show for Obama. It means that the military has directly responded by saying Obama is illegitimate -- and they cannot fight it. Therefore, they are revoking the order!"

Maj. Stefan F. Cook, who told WND he wants to serve in Afghanistan, said, "As an officer it is [my] duty to gain clarification on any order we may believe illegal. With that said, if President Obama is found not be a 'natural born citizen' he is not eligible to be commander-in-chief....Should I deploy, I would essentially be following

an illegal [order]. If I happened to be captured I would not be privy to the Geneva Convention protections."

"Barack Hussein Obama, in order to prove his constitutional eligibility to serve as president, basically needs only produce a single unique historical document for the Plaintiff's inspection and authentication: namely, the 'long-form' birth certificate which will confirm whether Barack Hussein Obama was in fact born to parents who were both citizens of the United States in Honolulu, Hawaii, in or about 1961," explains the complaint.

The Constitution, Article 2, Section 1, states, "No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President."

MSNBC anchor Keith Olbermann called Cook a "jackass" and Taitz a "conwoman" and labeled both of them the "worst persons in the world." He played the soldier as "an embarrassment to all those who have served without cowardice."

WMD has reported that among the documentation not yet available for Obama includes his kindergarten records, his Punahou school records, his Occidental College records, his Columbia University records, his Columbia thesis, his Harvard Law School records, his Harvard Law Review articles, his scholarly articles from the University of Chicago, his passport, his medical records, his files from his years as an Illinois state senator, his Illinois State Bar Association records, any baptism records, and his adoption records.

--WorldNetDaily July 14, 2009

WHAT YOU DON'T KNOW CAN'T HURT THEM

Camps within this [alleged conspiratorial] oligarchy make effective use of the Bilderberg Group, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Economic Forum at Davos, Bank of International Settlements, World Trade Organization, Council on Foreign Relations, Trilateral Commission, Bohemian Grove, Group of Eight, Trans-Atlantic Business Council, and other organizations to calibrate their rhetoric, achieve consensus, and even set policy superseding that of sovereign governments. This isn't done in smoky star chambers, however, but in the miasmic group-think of those with similar backgrounds, class interests, and institutional positions, all pursuing the interests of the global capitalist

system by pursuing misguided senses of their own self interest.

As the key nations of transnational corporate imperialism degenerate into police states, they slowly strip citizens of their rights, periodically manufacturing incidents and crises to use as excuses for increased governmental power. Meanwhile, the media toes the government line, lulling the people – or the "sheeple" – to sleep. Eventually, agencies such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF), and militarized local police will confiscate all weapons and imprison any citizens who dare oppose authoritarian rule.

-- Rigorous Intuition blogspot.com, March 2005

Defenseless in Jersey?

New Jersey law states that Firearm Purchaser ID cards and Handgun purchase permits must be issued to the applicant no later than 30 days after the application is submitted.

But only 1 out of 566 municipalities in NJ actually follows the law!!! In some towns, it takes almost a full year for a citizen to get their ID card another year to get a HPP!!!

The recent passage of S1774 restricts an applicant to 1 handgun permit per application. This law, in conjunction with the blatant disregard of the 30 day statute, essentially is an outright denial of the peoples' right to purchase firearms in NJ.

Another point is the gross denial of concealed carry.

New Jersey is a "may-Issue" state. The text of the law states "justifiable need" is required for a citizen to obtain a concealed carry permit. The text does not define "Justifiable Need" So it is up to the discretion of the local police chief and/or the state superior court judge to grant or deny the permit. Basically, If the applicant is:

*Not a high ranking government official

*Not related to a high ranking government official by blood or marriage

*Not a celebrity

*Not working with large sums of cash (i.e. armored car guard)

You will be denied your right to carry a firearm. (NO EXCEPTIONS)

"A strange man has been stalking me, I need to protect myself"- DENIED

"My employer is located on Perry street in Trenton and I work nights, I need to protect myself"-

DENIED

"I live alone and my ex-husband has threatened to kill me"- DENIED

To anyone unfamiliar with the Bill of rights, please note the last clause of the United States Second Amendment: ***...the right of the People to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.***

and the New Jersey Constitution Article I, [1.]: ***"All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness."***

CFR advises, Hillary obeys

Thank you very much, Richard, and I am delighted to be here in these new [Washington, DC] headquarters [of the CFR]. I have been often to, I guess, the mother ship in New York City, but it's good to have an outpost of the Council right here down the street from the State Department. We get a lot of advice from the Council, so this will mean I won't have as far to go to be told what we should be doing and how we should think about the future.

-- Foreign Policy Address at the Council on Foreign Relations by Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State, July 15, 2009, www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/july/126071.htm

CFR recommends, Obama obeys

The uber-establishment Council on Foreign Relations said Wednesday it favors granting legal status to many of the roughly 12 million illegal immigrants in the U.S., creating a guest worker program for low-skilled foreign workers to work in the U.S and opposes local police getting to conduct immigration raids.

The CFR issued an immigration policy report Wednesday that looks to lift caps on foreign university students in the U.S. and allow skilled foreign graduates to get more work visas.

The CFR's recommendations on guest workers and amnesty mirror plans to be pushed in Congress this year by President Barack Obama.

Arizona State university professor Raul H. Yzaguirre and former Florida governor Jeb Bush served on the CFR task force that wrote the recommendations.

-- Phoenix Business Journal, July 8, 2009

Tax evaders found guilty on weapons charges

Tax evaders Ed and Elaine Brown were convicted Thursday of amassing weapons, explosives and booby traps and plotting to kill federal agents during a standoff at their fort-like home in rural New Hampshire.

The couple, who do not recognize the federal government's authority to tax its citizens, held hands and looked straight ahead as the verdict was read. They refused to stand when the jury and judge left the courtroom.

Combined, the maximum penalty for Brown, 66, and his wife, 68, are two life sentences.

From January to October 2007, the Browns holed up in their hilltop home behind 8-inch concrete walls to avoid arrest and 63-month prison sentences on convictions of conspiring to evade taxes on Elaine Brown's nearly \$2 million from her dental practice.

During the standoff, the Browns welcomed a parade of anti-tax, anti-government sympathizers, four of whom have been convicted of helping them stockpile weapons and sent to prison.

In one media interview, Ed Brown said: "The chief should know, along with the U.S. marshals, along with the local county sheriff -- especially the county sheriff, local police and local state police -- if they come in here to do us in, they kill my wife, myself or both or try to arrest us, I said the chief of police in this town, the sheriff, the sheriff himself will die. This is war now, folks."

The two were arrested -- no shots fired -- by U.S. marshals pretending to be supporters who pounced on the couple while sharing pizza with them on their front porch.

During the trial, Ed Brown testified the weapons were for self-defense, saying he believed the government planned to kill him and his wife. He said he didn't start building the bombs until after federal agents made a failed attempt to arrest him. He also said the property was booby trapped to scare intruders, not harm them.

"By rejecting the rule of the law and substituting a personal code involving weapons, explosives and threats, the defendants committed increasingly serious crimes," acting U.S. Attorney Michael Gunnison said.

"Their conduct has no place in a civil society."

-- Boston *Globe*, July 9, 2009

"The County Sheriff: America's Last Hope"

We know who America's foreign enemies are, Richard Mack told the crowd.

The domestic enemy he fights today is a federal government he says is bent on taking away people's rights and freedoms.

And who can fight the massive federal government?

Your local sheriff, he said.

Mack - a former two-term sheriff in Graham County, Ariz., who along with former Ravalli County Sheriff Jay Printz, successfully sued the federal government when the Clinton administration demanded county sheriffs enforce provisions of the Brady Bill gun control law - said his movement seeks to target 1,000 sheriff races across the U.S. in 2010.

"We can have our country back," Mack said, "but if you think the answer is in Washington, D.C., I've got beachfront in Oklahoma for you."

All law enforcement officers, from the FBI down to the local meter maid, derive their powers from the people, Mack said, but the only law enforcement officers in the land who answer directly to the people are county sheriffs [because they are the only law enforcement officers directly elected by the people].

His book, "The County Sheriff, America's Last Hope" spells out why he believes sheriffs are the last line of defense for the constitutional rights of U.S. citizens.

While many of Mack's backers are gun owners who believe the country is taking away their Second Amendment rights, Mack said true "constitutional" sheriffs will protect the rights and freedoms of all Americans on any front.

"What would a constitutional sheriff have done in 1959?" Mack asked the crowd.

When the call came in to the Montgomery County, Ala., sheriff's office that a black woman was refusing to move to the back of the bus - as required by law - the sheriff would have arrived on the scene and talked to Rosa Parks.

"Ma'am, what's the problem," a constitutional sheriff would have asked her, Mack said. Told she had taken an empty seat and just wanted to be left alone, the constitutional sheriff would have sat down next to her,

ridden with her to her stop - and, once off, for good measure taken her into a whites-only restaurant so she could buy sandwiches for her and her husband.

He'd have then escorted her home, Mack said - asked if her husband was armed and could defend his family if anyone upset by what had happened came around and threatened them - and ordered extra patrols of the house.

"Remember, segregation wasn't a tradition, it was the law of the land," Mack said. "Rosa Parks taught us what you do with stupid laws."

Mack said the Constitution gives the federal government the authority to police exactly four areas: treason, piracy, treaty violations and counterfeiting.

"The other 5,000 they've stolen and usurped from state and local authorities," he said. "The very people who have promised us they will protect and defend the Constitution are the ones who are destroying it."

In his 49-page book, Mack quotes Founding Fathers who warned that a centralized power in government would lead to one, in Thomas Jefferson's words, "as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

"Sheriff," he writes in his book, "you are the sworn protector. You cannot shrink from that duty merely because the violator comes to town with a three-piece suit and a fancy attache case."

-- www.missoulain.com July 7, 2009

ABA gives Supreme Court nominee its highest rating

Supreme Court nominee Sonia Sotomayor has been deemed "well qualified" by an American Bar Association panel - the highest rating the national attorney organization bestows.

Sotomayor, 55, has been a federal judge since 1992 and has held a seat on the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals for the last 11 years.

"The ABA's rating - an evaluation of integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament should eliminate the doubts of naysayers who have questioned Judge Sotomayor's disposition on the bench," said Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Sen. Jeff Sessions, the Judiciary Committee's top Republican, questioned whether the Latino judge would utilize judicial "empathy" on the

bench to favor certain disadvantaged groups over others.

"Thus far, our review of Judge Sotomayor's record suggests that she may wholeheartedly embrace the president's notion of empathy," said Sessions.

The National Rifle Assn. sent a letter to Leahy and Sessions stating its concern over Sotomayor's gun-rights jurisprudence, citing a decision earlier this year by Sotomayor who found that the individual right of gun ownership under the 2nd Amendment did not extend to the states.

"Out of respect for the confirmation process, the NRA has not announced an official position on Judge Sotomayor's confirmation," executive director Chris W. Cox wrote. "However, should her answers regarding the Second Amendment at the upcoming hearings be hostile or evasive, we will have no choice but to oppose her nomination to the Court."

Major law enforcement organizations support Sotomayor, including the Fraternal Order of Police and the National Sheriffs Assn.

-- Los Angeles Times, July 6, 2009

NRA Statement on Judge Sotomayor's nomination

It is only by ignoring history that any judge can say that the Second Amendment [i.e., the right to keep and bear arms] is not a fundamental right and does not apply to the states. The one part of the Bill of Rights that Congress clearly intended to apply to all Americans in passing the Fourteenth Amendment was the Second Amendment. History and congressional debate are clear on this point.

Yet Judge Sotomayor seems to believe that the Second Amendment is limited only to the residents of federal enclaves such as Washington, D.C. and does not protect all Americans living in every corner of this nation. In her *Maloney* opinion and during the confirmation hearings, she deliberately misread Supreme Court precedent to support her incorrect view.

We believe any individual who

does not agree that the Second Amendment guarantees a fundamental right and who does not respect our God-given right of self-defense should not serve on any court, much less the highest court in the land. Therefore, the National Rifle Association of America opposes the confirmation of Judge Sonia Sotomayor to the position of Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

-- NRA/ILA Alert July 16, 2009

Note: Sotomayor's most controversial rulings on gun rights came in two cases. In *Maloney v. Cuomo*, she ruled the Second Amendment did not apply to state and local governments. In *United States v. Sanchez-Villar*, she ruled that gun ownership is not a fundamental right.

The Stoning of Soraya M

Reviewed by Steve Emerson

Cyrus Nowrasteh's *The Stoning of Soraya M.* is one of the most riveting films I have ever seen. Inspired by French journalist Freidoune Sahebjam's international bestseller of the same name, this compelling story sheds light on Islamist mob rule and the horrific honor killings associated with countries that follow Sharia law.

Set in a small Iranian village in the mid-1980s, Soraya's husband trumps up charges of infidelity so that he can marry a 14-year-old girl. He enlists the local mullah and fellow villagers to conduct an all-male tribunal that declares Soraya guilty. Her sentence is death by public stoning, still employed in Iran and other radical Islamic countries.

It's the true story of Zahra, Soraya's aunt who spots a war correspondent passing through town. Soraya had been executed the day before, and her aunt's raw outrage gives her the courage to demand that the reporter tape-record her story.

Reports suggest that at least 1,000 women were stoned to death over the past 15 years in countries such as Iran, Nigeria, Somalia, Sudan, Iraq, United Arab Emirates, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

The United Nations estimates

that 5,000 women each year become victims of "honor crimes" in which family members kill a woman who has allegedly brought dishonor on them.

Within the last year, two cases have made headlines in the U.S. In Jonesboro, Georgia Chaudhry Rashid was accused of killing his daughter because she wanted out of an arranged marriage. In February, Aasiyah Hassan was decapitated in upstate New York. Her husband is believed to have become enraged because she filed for divorce.

"No one has ever shown a stoning on film before," says Nowrasteh. "All I can tell you is that compared to what I saw and read, the scene in the movie is far less graphic than it could have been. Most of all, I wanted to capture the whole ritual design of it and how it affects the crowd."

"One thing I can do is to really make people aware that this is happening wherever women are still treated as second-class citizens. My biggest hope is that people will fall in love with these women and their courage."

This story will haunt you. When I first saw the film, I sat, along with other members of the audience, in silence and in shock for at least 10 minutes after the film ended. I cried for the first time in years. I have now seen the film more than a dozen times and each viewing has given me a different experience.

At the same time, each has inspired me to keep fighting the Islamist mobsters and Islamic radicals that govern hundreds of millions of people in the Muslim world and have established deceptive and totalitarian strangleholds over Muslim populations in the west.

If there is only one film that you watch this year, or just one that you watch for the rest of your life, this should be the one. It will profoundly change your life.

-- Steve Emerson is executive director of the Investigative Project on Terrorism

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 521-4147

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____